Answering K’s: Going Farther Left

Set of characteristics that define kritikal arguments: Question assumptions of line of thoughts. Convoluted, dense rhetoric. Descriptive, philosophical claims. The impacts are a lot of –ations; they’re very broad.

Going farther left takes the criticizer’s assumptions in the kritik and turn them on your opponent. There are some necessary skills to do this:

1. Be well-read in continental philosophy. This increases your vocabulary and concepts that recur throughout the literature. You become smarter through this work.
2. Learn militant skepticism. You need to think that your opponent and their arguments are always wrong.
3. Be confident. The likelihood that a judge will buy your farther-left position increases exponentially with your confidence level. However, you need to be confident along with having substantive analysis.

Techniques of the strategy:

1. The turn. Identify what is being criticized. Then, leverage the standard to kritik the AC. Third, determine whether the AC’s reform methods work within or outside of the system and how far left they have gone. Further, go for the jugular: take whatever standard they’re using and beat them over the head with it.
2. Essentialism. Functionally proscribing essential qualities to a group. Marginalizes the viewpoints of individuals who do not conform to the group. Weighing between essentialism-bad versus the initial kritik can get very muddled.
3. Liberator. Many kritiks take on a paternalistic approach where the speaker tries to save everyone else. The ruse of solvency – they attempt to solve for the harms here, yet they fail, so they cause more harm because we ignore the problem now that it’s “solved.” Ruse of solvency is especially strong against kritiks because we stop the kritik’s impacts: discourse and micropolitics.

Advantages of the strategy:

1. Holding the line. If you accept your opponent’s premise on the framework, they can’t go even more kritikal to beat you.
2. Going farther left lets the copy-cat debater make a PIC. If you accept most of your opponent’s framework, you access all their offense but can argue for a more ideal position.
3. You make them draw the line. They strategically drew the kritikal line for a reason, so you take them farther to try to win. However, going too far left can alienate people who are trying to access the movement.

Disadvantages of the strategy:

1. Judges who don’t like kritikal positions will not enjoy watching you go farther left.
2. Some positions are so incomprehensible that trying to engage them kritikally may be near impossible.
3. Being too eager to go farther left may make you inclined to ignore obvious oversights.